



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,686	12/13/2001	Vildana Jahic	0070450-0024	9567

23600 7590 08/27/2003

COUDERT BROTHERS LLP
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET
23RD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

ROY, SIKHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/017,686

Applicant(s)

JAHIC, VILDANA

Examiner

Sikha Roy

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 6 line 21 'bulb 130' should be replaced by --bulb 100--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al.

Regarding claim 1 Wilhelm discloses (Figs. 1 and 3 column 4 lines 1-11) an incandescent lamp comprising a bulb (envelope) 1 and a metal sleeve 9 coupled to a portion of the bulb.

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Wilhelm discloses (column 3 lines 13-15) the metal sleeve can be comprised of brass, which may be plated with nickel.

Regarding claim 4 Wilhelm discloses (column 4 lines 3-8) the pinched portion 2 of the bulb is inserted into the sleeve with a clamping fit.

Art Unit: 2879

Claims 1,2,5,6,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,053,935 to Hellwig et al.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 8 Hellwig discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 24-53) an electric lamp 4 comprising a bulb 5, a sleeve 9 (metal centering member) coupled to the bulb and a reflector 1 coupled to the sleeve.

Regarding claim 2 Hellwig discloses (column 2 lines 46-48) the metal sleeve is made of brass.

Referring to claim 5 Hellwig discloses (column 3 line 8 –column 4 lines 1-4) the sleeve (centering member) is coupled to the bulb via adhesive cement 12.

Claims 1, 5 - 8,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,403,276 to Blaisdell.

Regarding claims 1,6 and 8, Blaisdell discloses (Figs. 1 and 2 column 3 lines 12-15, 65-68, column 4 lines 1-5) a lamp unit comprising bulb 13, a metallic sleeve (retention means) 31 coupled to the bulb and a reflector 11 coupled to the sleeve 31.

Regarding claim 7 Blaisdell discloses (column 5 lines 5-20, Fig. 2) the sleeve 31 includes a notch (depressable spring secured to the member 31) to attach the sleeve to the reflector.

Referring to claims 5 and 11 Blaisdell discloses (column 3 lines 65-68 Fig. 2) the sleeve (retention means 31) is fixedly secured to the lamp by an adhesive (bonding) cement 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al.

Claim 5 differs from Wilhelm in that Wilhelm does not exemplify the sleeve coupled to the bulb via adhesive cement.

It is well known in the art to use adhesive cement as attaching means for coupling the sleeve to the bulb (as is disclosed by Wilhelm column 1 lines 37,38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to couple the metal sleeve with the bulb using adhesive cement.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,403,276 to Blaisdell in view of U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al.

Regarding claim 9 Blaisdell does not disclose the metal sleeve being brass plated with nickel.

Wilhelm in analogous art of electric lamp with sleeve discloses (column 3 lines 13-15) the metal sleeve can be comprised of brass plated with nickel.

The selection of known materials for a known purpose is generally considered to be within the skill of the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the sleeve made of steel of Blaisdell by

Art Unit: 2879

nickel plated brass as taught by Wilhelm because the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Claim 10 differs from Blaisdell in that Blaisdell does not disclose the sleeve coupled to the bulb by press fit.

Wilhelm discloses (abstract, column 1 lines 11,12) the pinch of the lamp envelope is accommodated in the sleeve by press fit (clamping fit). It is further disclosed that this design for securing the lamp envelope avoids the use of cement which may be decomposed and crumbled off with heat and time.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use press fit as disclosed by Wilhelm for securing the lamp envelope of Blaisdell to the metallic sleeve for avoiding the use of cement which may be decomposed and crumbled off with heat and time.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 3,825,785 to Robinson discloses lamp cap with a sleeve made of expanded metal promoting heat dissipation. U.S. Patent 3,936,686 to Moore discloses cooling assembly for a reflector lamp. U.S. Patent 5,206,558 to Losonczi et al. and U.S. Patent 5,726,525 to Friederichs disclose use of metal sleeve coupled to the reflector of the lamp.

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (703) 308-2826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

S.R.

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879


ASHOK PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER